

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/679,661	10/07/2003	Heinrich Zitzmann	3193 DIV	4097
22474	7590 03/05/2004		EXAMINER	
DOUGHERTY, CLEMENTS & HOFER			EASTHOM, KARL D	
1901 ROXBOROUGH ROAD SUITE300		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28211			2832	
			DATE MAILED: 03/05/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/679,661	ZITZMANN, HEINRICH				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Karl D Easthom	2832				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		L				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timer within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
,						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 14-17</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 14-17</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers		~				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09889298.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
and Parking from the Literation of December						
application from the International Bureau	ity documents have been receive					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ed in this National Stage				
• •	rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	rity documents have been received a (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  of the certified copies not received	ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list  Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not received  4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ed in this National Stage ed.  (PTO-413) ate				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the state of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the state of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the state of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the state of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the state of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the state o	ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not received  4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ed in this National Stage ed.  (PTO-413)				

Art Unit: 2832

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 5 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friese et al. '007 in view of Tani et al., Murata et al., or Gerblinger et al. Friese discloses the claimed invention at Figs. 1 or 2 except the platinum film resistor 6 being thin film. Tani discloses a platinum film resistor 14 that can be produced by thin or thick film techniques for use as a temperature sensor (sputtering or screen printing - col. 3, lines 49-52) such that it would have been obvious to employ either type of platinum film where both are known in the temperature sensor resistor arts. Murata at col. 4, lines 1-12 also discloses that the platinum temperature sensing film may be thin or thick for use as a temperature sensor in a multilayered sensor such as that of Friese. One would be motivated to interchange the two depending on the equipment and materials available, or the response desired. In Friese, the glaze layer 4 is the connecting layer, described as a frame, such that it is in the border area as a sealing frame. A glaze is "a smooth, thin, shiny coating" Webster's II, New Riverside University Dictionary. As an alternative, in Gerblinger et al., the glass layer US is used to connect a thin or thick film layer to a ceramic layer, see abstract, for the purpose of protecting the thin film platinum layer, so that it would have been obvious to employ the glaze layer and thin film resistor in the Friese et al. device (thus meeting claim 17 also). The frame of Friese is depicted as a hermetically sealing

frame surrounding the resistor 6 in Fig. 2, and described as a frame, see col. 3, lines 53-60, col.

5, lines 21-52. The ceramic cover and ceramic substrate are either 3, or films 1 and 11. The

Art Unit: 2832

additional layers meet claim 16. See col 5, line 50-51, col. 4, lines 8-14. In claim 14, the ceramic substrate 4 is alumina. In claim 15, the cover layer 4' at Fig. 2 is alumina. In claim 16, film 11 meets the claim as a cover layer and it is on the peripheral edges, as well as the remaining portions.

- 3. Claims 5 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friese et al. '007 in view of Tani et al, as applied to claims above, and further in view of Wienand et al. The claimed invention is disclosed except the sealing glaze and sealing cover being of glass. For claim 5, assuming arguendo the word "glaze" is not met by the YSZ frame in Friese, Wienand discloses high melting glass solder at col. 4, lines 3-11 for attaching ceramic plates together such that it would have been obvious to employ the material for attachment as a replacement for the attachment means of Friese. Wienand also disclose an additional cover of glass 14 for added protection such that it would have been obvious to employ that (claims 16-17) for that reason in the device of Friese.
- 4. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friese et al. '007 in view of Gerblinger et al., as applied to claims above, and further in view of Wienand et al. The claimed invention is disclosed except the sealing cover being of glass. Wienand also disclose an additional cover of glass 14 for added protection such that it would have been obvious to employ that for that reason in the device of Friese.
- 5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/14/03 have been fully considered but they are persuasive only in part as to claims noted above. Applicant argues that the word "glaze" is derived from the German "glasur" form the translation. This is not the standard for patent applications.—If———something is missing from the original translation, this is a written description problem and no

Application/Control Number: 10/679,661

Art Unit: 2832

Page 4

such meaning carries over to the US case. Thus, the term glaze is give its broadest reasonable interpretation, as noted by a dictionary definition. Also note that Gerblinger above employs a glass layer for connection to a ceramic layer. Applicant argues there is no motivation for a thin film because one would not interchange that with a thick film for various reasons. This argument is contradicted by the prior art of Murata, Tani, and Gerblinger et al., which discloses interchanging thin and thick films in devices very similar to that of Friese - multilayered platinum temperature sensors. One would be motivated to do so depending on the equipment and materials available, or the response desired. If any problem exists with firing the films together, one could have fired the ceramic insulating plates first and then put the thin films on same. Note too that "thin films" are not "pastes" nor thinner thick films, as apparently argued, and the Examiner does not consider the thin films claimed as thinner thick films for this record.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl Easthom whose telephone number is (703)308-3306. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad, can be reached on (703)308-7619. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)308-7722. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

KARL D. EASTHOM